Ham-Policy Digest   Sun, 31 Jul 94   Volume 94 : Issue 338

Today's Topics:
            A quiet voice for Novice Class NOT time-limited
          Digital mode subbands (was Re: CW is FUN!! reprise)
                   Q: What is 303MHz allocated for?
                    What is wrong with h (4 msgs)
             What is wrong with h (what was this word?)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 94 17:23:38 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: A quiet voice for Novice Class NOT time-limited
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> writes:

>The situation for a Novice is very different that that for a Tech. I
>think the Novice privileges are much more in line with the testing
>required than are the Tech privileges, where everything above 30MHz is
>awarded by taking what for many (most?) is an *easier* test. I think the
>carrot of more privileges is enough to motivate most Novices, but I don't
>feel the same about the Tech license

TheTech (no-code) takes the same written element as the Novice, plus one
more. The Novice passes one code element that the Tech (no-code) has not.
Seems like a fairly even trade off.

How do you feel about the Tech Plus?

Date: 30 Jul 94 16:16:29
From: koriel!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2!rfm@ames.arpa
Subject: Digital mode subbands (was Re: CW is FUN!! reprise)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Help! I think the lack of sunspots is affecting our brains!

Tech Plus (and Novices, natch) *already* have HF digital privileges, on 10
meters.

Rich
--
Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 29 Jul 1994 19:57:51 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-
winken.llnl.gov!koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!spot!
myers@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Q: What is 303MHz allocated for?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 65snx@n2ayj.overleaf.com, n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com (Stan Olochwoszcz
N2AYJ) writes:
>In article <316db6$rn8@vixen.cso.uiuc.edu> mitchell@ncsa.uiuc.edu writes:
>>
>>The subject just about says it all. I've got an interesting
>>device which I don't know what it does. One thing I do know is
>>that it appears to have a 303MHz transmitter in it. If someone
>>could e-mail me and let me know what the 'official' use of this
>>band is, I would really appreciate it.
>
>Und ve voot be FERRY hinterested to knowing frumm vere yo haf
>obtain-ed diss dewice, hmmmm? ;-)
>
>--
>Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com
>P.C. Simpletons Charged in Death of Humor. Film at eleven.

300MHz is home to some Part 15 remote control devices, like garage
door openers. Nothing mystical :-).

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 1994 01:38:50 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: What is wrong with h
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <40.2573.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky)
writes:
>
>JH>Will, I don't recall hearing anyone say that. The reasons for
>JH>learning code are substantial, the least of which is ``I had to so -
>JH>so should you''.
>
>Lets have some of those substantial reasons posted for a change.
>
>N1SSO

They've been posted over and over and over and...

Go read the archives. Better yet, take a break from posting so you
can work on your code.

Jeff NH6IL / PH0OOEY
jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

Date: 30 Jul 1994 15:27:02 -0600
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What is wrong with h
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <40.2570.2427@channel1.com>,
Alan Wilensky <alan.wilensky@channel1.com> wrote:
>JM>Used to be that f someone wanted something badly enough, he'd do what
>JM>it took to get it. Now he just whines about "relevance" and tris to
>JM>get standards lowered until he can get in with no work.
>So you mean that a bunch of CW ops can loaf on thier butts for 50 or so
>years because they passeda CW test. But it falls on the codeless crowd

>to prove they can innovate.

We met the requirements as they existed at the time. We were promised an
explosion of technical innovation from the folks who would join the ranks as
soon as we dropped the nasty, ancient, irrelevant code test. We rolled over.

>Well listen brother, its only been three years and you aint seen nothin
>yet.

That's exactly right. We haven't seen a damned thing yet.

I would dearly love to be proven wrong and see a flood of technical innovation
from the engineering crowd that moans so loudly about the code requirement. At
this point, I'm not very hopeful. All we did is lower the standards for entry
into the service, and we haven't seen the promised return yet.

I intend to keep calling 'em as I see 'em.
--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
    "From now on, when someone asks you where you're from, you tell 'em
            'Houston, city of champions!'" -- Rudy Tomjanovich

----

Date: 30 Jul 94 16:08:33
From: koriel!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2!rfm@ames.arpa
Subject: What is wrong with h
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The problem with this "where's the innovation from the codeless techs?"
argument is it presupposes the 1940's "Astounding Science Fiction" mechanism
for change: every advance is due to a lone genius who creates new
technologies in his backyard shop. That ain't the way it works. One
important way technically aware people help ham radio is by demanding better
equipment from the commercial suppliers, and providing a market to make it
feasable to produce that equipment. For example, anybody who's been in the
computer industry knows that we were all assured that 9600 bps was the
absolute top bit rate on voice-bandwidth phone lines, and even then you
needed a specially conditioned line -- all you could possibly expect on
switched circuits was 1200 bps, and that was gonna cost you a bunch of
dough. These folks are not satisfied with 1200 bps packet, and tend not to
believe people that say that's all that's possible! Note we're now
beginning to see 9600bps-ready radios from the major manufacturers.

Rich

--
Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 31 Jul 1994 00:43:28 GMT
From: koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!bigboy!myers@ames.arpa
Subject: What is wrong with h
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CtqCKr.M00@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>In article <40.2573.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky)
writes:
>>
>>JH>Will, I don't recall hearing anyone say that. The reasons for
>>JH>learning code are substantial, the least of which is ``I had to so -
>>JH>so should you''.
>>
>>Lets have some of those substantial reasons posted for a change.
>>
>>N1SSO
>
>They've been posted over and over and over and...
>
>Go read the archives. Better yet, take a break from posting so you
>can work on your code.

Given a chance to support his frequent statement of opinion as fact,
Jeff deflects with a "read the archives and go away".

C'mon, Jeff, try harder. If you were grading a proof, you wouldn't
accept this kind of argument. Your credibility is at stake here;
please dredge up some facts, or we'll all be left to ponder that you've
been stating unsupportable opinion as fact, and I know how much
you like that :-).

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
    *
 * (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
    *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 31 Jul 1994 01:14:12 GMT
From: koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!bigboy!myers@ames.arpa
Subject: What is wrong with h (what was this word?)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Ctpxu1.I1y@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>In article <40.2553.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky)
writes:
>>The current structure
>>JM>has the distinct advantage that _everyone_ has to work to get a
>>JM>license and to advance
>>JM>within the ranks.
>>
>>Well then instead of A cw test, why not push-ups, crossword puzzles, or
>>speed soldering?
>
>Because HF QSO's are not conducted via push-ups nor via crossword
>puzzles nor via speed soldering. But if you'll post fewer articles
>and fill your time listening to HF you'll find that at least 50%
>of HF QSO's are conducted via CW.

Hmmm... I listened to 10m the other day, and the number of SSB
conversations outnumbered the CW conversations at least an order
of magnitude. :-)

Dana
--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
     *
 * (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
     *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 30 Jul 1994 18:53:44 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.2570.2427@channel1.com>, <31egj6$2rm@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<RFM.94Jul30160833@urth.eng.sun.com>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with h

In article <RFM.94Jul30160833@urth.eng.sun.com>,
Richard McAllister <rfm@urth.eng.sun.com> wrote:
>The problem with this "where's the innovation from the codeless techs?"
>argument is it presupposes the 1940's "Astounding Science Fiction" mechanism
>for change: every advance is due to a lone genius who creates new
>technologies in his backyard shop. That ain't the way it works.

That is the way it's worked in the past, and what we were promised by the
no-code advocates...after all, they weren't doing it before, since the nasty,
archaic, eeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeevil code requirement was keeping them
away.

>Note we're now
>beginning to see 9600bps-ready radios from the major manufacturers.

Whoopee. That's hardly the major advance in technology we were promised
faithfully if we'd just roll over and lower the standards.
--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
    "From now on, when someone asks you where you're from, you tell 'em
             'Houston, city of champions!'" -- Rudy Tomjanovich

----

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 1994 18:02:53 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
mzenier@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <mzenierCtop0q.5qv@netcom.com>, <ddtodd.176.000E3992@ucdavis.edu>,
<Ctq32x.HJB@world.std.com>≥
Subject : Re: Part 15 in electronic format?

David R Tucker (drt@world.std.com) wrote:
: : the whole thing because I'd like another copy of part 97 etc...
: : Any idea how current I will be able to find it at the bookstores?

: Like B. Dalton? Forget it.

: There are US Government bookstores in a number of major cities
: (Boston's is right next to the Boston Garden, for example) and they
: carry the things. Look under "GOV'T PRINTING OFFICE - Book Store" in
: the phone book. 47 CFR Part 80 to End, includes Marine, Aeronautical,
: Private Land Mobile, Personal, Amateur, and some other stuff, is the
: fifth volume of FCC regs, and if I remember is something like $18. I
: think Part 15 is included in the first volume, for a similar price.
: They're 1 to 2 years old. You can also look in a library - call first

: to be sure they have it, either printed or on fiche - around here,
: they're 1 to 3 years out of date, depending.

The deadline date (the date on the cover) is October 1 of each year
for Title 47. It's usually in the Govmt. Bookstore by February of the
following year.

Mark Zenier mzenier@netcom.com mzenier@eskimo.com

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 22:54:43 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <318of3$3h6@chnews.intel.com>, <Ctou9H.5y3@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<1994Jul29.155440.10025@mixcom.mixcom.com>Æ
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <1994Jul29.155440.10025@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:
>In <Ctou9H.5y3@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>
>>Is CW more important than any other mode? At least 50% of HF QSO's
>>are done utilizing CW. Others have confirmed my counts. So it makes
>>sense to require CW for HF access.
>
>Wow! Truly amazing when you consider 100% of all HF operators MUST pass a
>CW test to get on HF in the first place. Thanks for the elightenment, Jeff!

Okay, to be fair let's test future HF operators on the two most used
modes: SSB and CW. What should the skill test be for SSB? The only
one I can think of is a speech test. But we already know how to talk
so let's waive the SSB speech test for everyone.

Once one of the less used modes becomes as popular as CW and/or SSB
then let's consider enacting a skill test for it instead of the code
or the (waived) speech test; this way there will always be a skill
test for the two most popular modes, no matter what they are.

Democracy.

Jeff NH6IL / PH0OEY
jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 23:00:46 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul27112856@urth.eng.sun.com>, <rogjdCtnJH3.DKn@netcom.com>,
<1994Jul29.112648.10564@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <1994Jul29.112648.10564@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
Coffman) writes:
>In article <rogjdCtnJH3.DKn@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington)
writes:
>>Richard McAllister (rfm@urth.eng.sun.com) wrote:
>>: In article <MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net> domonkos@access.digex.net
(Andy Domonkos) writes:
>>
>>: >I went from 0 to 15 wpm in 30 days.
>>
>>: Some people have the talent. It took me about 6 months of 30-60 minutes a
>>: day, which is a large portion of my free time. I think I'm more typical.
>>: Others have tried for years and never cracked the 10 WPM barrier. It's hard
>>: to tell ahead of time how long it will take a given person to learn.
>>
>>6 months of 30-60 minutes/day is wildly more than it takes 99% of the
>>hams to learn cw. Something was wrong with your study approach.
>
>Something is wrong with your sample. No doubt 99% of (pre-code test
>free licensing) *hams* didn't have as much trouble learning Morse,
>those who did have trouble aren't *hams*. They gave up.

That's why the code-free license was created. All that gigahertz
of spectrum just waiting to be explored.

Jeff NH6IL / PH0OEY
jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

Date: 31 Jul 1994 01:12:26 GMT
From: koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!bigboy!myers@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Ctou9H.5y3@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <RFM.94Jul29172716@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<CtqxBv.5F8@news.Hawaii.Edu>¸É
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <CtqxBv.5F8@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>In article <RFM.94Jul29172716@urth.eng.sun.com> rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard
McAllister) writes:
>>In article <Ctou9H.5y3@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>>
>>>Is CW more important than any other mode? At least 50% of HF QSO's
>>>are done utilizing CW. Others have confirmed my counts.
>>
>>Jeff, I haven't seen anybody post numbers besides mine, which showed
>>more CW QSO's than either digital or voice, but less than 50%.
>>A plurality, not a majority.
>
>There's more lurkers on UseNet than active participants; most will not
>openly post for reasons known only to themselves, so they choose to
>state their opinions via email. At times I get a lot of response
>from these folks privately - some disagree (and are downright nasty!)
>but most agree with my views.

Hmmm... thr Rush Limbaugh approach to proving your point. "I've got
letters and phone calls!". But no independently verifiable facts.
Too bad.

>President Nixon coined a phrase which could be applied to these lurkers:
>The Silent Majority.

In other words, the non-extant majority. If I can't see 'em, you can't
show them to me. Let's discuss realities, verifiable, repeatable
numbers, not opinions? At least, if you're going to make statements
of opinion, don't hide it as fact... OK?

>So let's have a skill test for the two most popular modes on HF:
>Code for CW, and speech for SSB. But we can waive the speech test
>since we all know how to talk.

There's more to SSB operation than just talking. For example, SSB
operators need to properly operate their transmitters, and issues
of proper drive level, linearity testing, etc., make sense to test
on.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #338
****